

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,162	08/10/2001	Mark A. Autry	INTL-0627-US (P12027)	7312
7590 09/22/2004			EXAMINER	
Timothy N. Trop			TRUJILLO, JAMES K	
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. STE. 100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8554 KATY FWY. HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805			2116	
			DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/928,162	AUTRY, MARK A.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	James K. Trujillo	2116				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 03 September 2004 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic I) a timely filed amendment which	cation. A proper reply to a chaplaces the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-26</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme						
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	REMANA PERVEEN				
		PRIMARY EXAMINER 9/20/04				
		1/1/2/				

Application No.

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are not persuasive. The rejections are respectfully maintained and are incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

Applicants argue in substance that Firooz does not teach modifying new code and thus does not teach or suggest the modifying of claim 1. The Examiner does not disagree with that assertion by the applicants. That is why reference to Choi is relied upon to teach this feature.

Applicants further argue in substance that Choi fails to teach or suggest the missing limitation. However, as addressed in the previous office actions it is believed that Choi does teach the missing limitation.

Lastly, applicants argue in substance that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Choi and Firooz. The Examiner has addressed the suggest/motivation to on page 3 of the final office action which refers to col. 2 lines 32-48 of Firooz. It is there that Firooz suggests to those of ordinary skill that some portions of a firmware memory remain unchanged. Firooz uses unchanged existing firmwar to replace portions of new firmware.